

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 16 2007

PLEASE NOTICE

For the second time, the Examiner has addressed the claims as they stood prior to the Amendment filed on March 13, 2006. The current Office Action is the fourth non-final Office Action listing the same set of allowable claims - claims 8, 10-20, 28-30, and 32-33. Applicant amended the claims to place them in condition for allowance in the Amendment filed on March 13, 2006. If the Examiner will simply recognize the amendment that was previously made, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now, and has been, in condition for allowance.

As evidence that the wrong claims have been considered in the current Office Action, Applicant points out the following discrepancies:

- 1) The current Office Action objects to allowable claims 10 and 28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, even though both claims were cancelled in the March 13, 2006 Amendment, and their elements were added to independent claims 1 and 24, respectively, to place claims 1 and 24 in condition for allowance.
- 2) The current Office Action objects to allowable claims 8, 13, 16, and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 8, 13, 16, and 17, however, were converted to independent form, and amended to include all the limitations of their base claim, in the March 13, 2006 Amendment.
- 3) The current Office Action's 102 rejection of independent claims 1 and 24 only makes reference to the claim elements of the originally filed claims. The

- 2 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17641
Application No.: 10/750,557

current Office Action fails to address elements added in the March 13, 2006 Amendment to claims 1 and 24 from allowable claims 10 and 28.

Claim Summary

Claims 1-9, 11- 27, and 29-33 remain in the present application. Claims 10 and 28 were previously cancelled in the March 13, 2006 Amendment without prejudice.

Office Action Summary

Claims 1-7, 9, 21-23, 24-27, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application 2004/0160370 by Ghosh et al.

Claims 8, 10-20, 28-30, and 32-33 were allowable but objected to for depending from rejected base claims (although claims 10 and 28 were previously canceled and claim 32 is not now, and has never been, a dependent claim).

Detailed Response

To reiterate, Applicant respectfully submits that the previous amendment of March 13, 2006 placed claims 1-9, 11- 27, and 29-33 in condition for allowance over the cited references.

Specifically, claim 1 was amended in the March 13, 2006 response to add the elements of allowable claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons claim 10 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Given that claims 2-7, 9, 11-12, and 21-23, as previously amended,

- 3 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17641
Application No.: 10/750,557

depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-7, 9, 11-12, and 21-23, as previously amended, are also now in condition for allowance over the cited references.

Claim 24 was amended in the March 13, 2006 response to add the elements of allowable claim 28. Therefore, for at least the reasons claim 28 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is in condition for allowance over the cited references. Given that claims 25-27 and 29-31, as previously amended, depend from claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-27 and 29-31, as previously amended, are also now in condition for allowance over the cited references.

Allowable claim 32 has always been in independent form. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to allowable claim 32, and its dependent claim 33, be withdrawn.

Allowable claims 8, 13, 16, and 17 were converted to independent form in the March 13, 2006 response, and amended to include all the limitations of the rejected base claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to allowable claims 8, 13, 16, and 17 be withdrawn.

Given that claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13, and claims 18-20 depend from claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits claims 14, 15, and 18-20 are also now in condition for allowance over the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9, 11-27, and 29-33 are in a condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Date: 2/16, 2007



Robert A. Diehl
Reg. No. 40,992

INTEL LEGAL
SC4-202
P.O. Box 5326
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Phone: (503) 712-1880
FAX: (503) 264-1729

- 5 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17641
Application No.: 10/750,557